



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,680	06/29/2001	Hiroyuki Ishiwata	208671US	9420

22850 7590 01/14/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

COLEMAN, BRENDA LIBBY

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1624

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/893,680

Applicant(s)

ISHIWATA et al.

Examiner

Brenda Coleman

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 15, 2002
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 2 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1624

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application.

Election/Restriction

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that a search and examination of all the claims would not impose a serious burden on the Office. This is not found persuasive because a diamine, a diazepine (where m is 2), a piperazine (where m is 1), a bispiperazine (where Y¹ and Y² are a nitrogen atom), a bispiperidine (where Y¹ and Y² are a CH group), a piperidine/piperazine (where one of Y¹ and Y² is a nitrogen atom and the other is a carbon atom) are clearly structurally dissimilar compound which are classified in various subclasses under classes 546, 544 and 540.

Note MPEP 2173.05(h) "where a Markush expression is applied only to a portion of a chemical compound, the propriety of the grouping is determined by a consideration of the compound as a whole, and does not depend on there being a community of properties in the members of the Markush expression.

Therefore, what should be considered for patentable distinctness is the compound as a whole. If a reference for one would not be a reference for the other, then restriction is considered proper. Community of properties is not enough to keep diamines, diazepines, piperazines and piperidines in the same Markush claim, where the Markush expression is applied only to a portion of a chemical compound. It is the compound as a whole bis(2-aryl-5-pyridyl)diamine, bis(2-aryl-

Art Unit: 1624

5-pyridyl)diazepine, bis(2-aryl-5-pyridyl)piperazine, etc., that must be considered for patentable distinctness.

Thus, separate searches in the literature would be required. However, should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

The degree of burden on the examiner is high. The class/subclass search on the elected invention where the compounds have a bis(2-aryl-5-pyridyl)diamine core would be as follows: class 514, subclasses 332 and class 546, subclass 264 which involved 776 US patents. The various classes and subclasses mentioned above represent only the degree of burden within the U.S. Patent Classification System, this does not include the search required in the prior art of journal articles and foreign patents.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 1, 2 and 4-14 are rejected as being drawn to an improper Markush group. The recited compounds, while possessing a common utility, differ widely in structure and are not art-recognized equivalents and are thus, independently distinct for the reasons set forth in the restriction above.

Art Unit: 1624

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed March 12, 2002 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), which requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Specification

4. The amendment filed July 10, 2002 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: halogeno(lower alkoxy) groups, lower alkoxy(lower alkoxy) groups and hydroxy(lower alkoxy) groups in the definition of the substituents for the aromatic hydrocarbon.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one

Art Unit: 1624

skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The amendment to claim 4 and claims dependent thereon where the substituents of the aromatic hydrocarbon are halogeno(lower alkoxy) groups, lower alkoxy(lower alkoxy) groups and hydroxy(lower alkoxy) groups is not described in the specification. These moieties for the substituents of the aromatic hydrocarbon are not positively described in the specification with respect to formula (1).

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office action.

6. Claims 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The scope of the method claims is not adequately enabled solely based on IgE antibodies provided in the specification. Instant claim language embraces disorders not only for treatment but for **prevention** which is not remotely enabled. It is presumed in the prevention of the diseases and/or disorders claimed herein there is a way of identifying those people who may develop allergic immunological disease, asthma, atopic dermatitis, allergic rhinitis, inflammatory bowel disease, contact dermatitis or allergic opthalmopathy. There is no evidence of record which would enable the skilled artisan in the identification of the people who have the potential of becoming afflicted with the disorders claimed herein.

Art Unit: 1624

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following reasons apply:

- a) Claim 3 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by “derivative”. “Derivative” in claim 3 implies more than what is positively recited. “Compound” is suggested.
- b) Claims 9-11 and 13 are vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by “medicinal composition”.
- c) Claim 12 is vague and indefinite in that the claim provides for the use of claimed compounds, but the claim does not set forth any steps involved in determining which are the diseases capable of being mediated by inhibiting the production of an IgE antibody. It is unclear which diseases are mediated by inhibiting the production of an IgE antibody? Determining whether a given disease responds or does not respond to such an inhibitor will involve undue experimentation. Suppose that a given drug, which has inhibitor properties *in vitro*, when administered to a patient with a certain disease, does not produce a favorable response. One can not conclude that specific disease does not fall within this claim. Keep in mind that:

Art Unit: 1624

A. It may be that the next patient will respond. No pharmaceutical has 100% efficacy. What success rate is required to conclude our drug is a treatment? Thus, how many patients need to be treated? If "successful treatment" is what is intended, what criterion is to be used? If one person in 10 responds to a given drug, does that mean that the disease is treatable? One in 100? 1,000? 10,000? Will the standard vary depending on the current therapy for the disease?

B. It may be that the wrong dosage or dosage regimen was employed. Drugs with similar chemical structures can have markedly different pharmacokinetics and metabolic fates. It is quite common for pharmaceuticals to work and or be safe at one dosage, but not at another that is significantly higher or lower. Furthermore, the dosage regimen may be vital --- should the drug be given e.g. once a day, or four times in divided dosages? The optimum route of administration can not be predicted in advance. Should our drug be given as a bolus *iv* or in a time release *po* formulation. Thus, how many dosages and dosage regimens must be tried before one is certain that our drug is not a treatment for this specific disease?

C. It may be that our specific drug, while active *in vitro*, simply is not potent enough or produces such low concentrations in the blood that it is not an effective treatment of the specific disease. Perhaps a structurally related drug is potent enough or produces high enough blood concentrations to treat the disease

Art Unit: 1624

in question, so that the first drug really does fall within the claim. Thus, how many different structurally related inhibitors must be tried before one concludes that a specific compound does not fall within the claim?

D. Conversely, if the disease responds to our second drug but not to the first, both of whom are inhibitors *in vitro*, can one really conclude that the disease falls within the claim? It may be that the first compound result is giving the accurate answer, and that the success of second compound arises from some other unknown property which the second drug is capable. It is common for a drug, particularly in area of allergic immunologics, to work by many mechanisms. The history of psychopharmacology is filled with drugs, which were claimed to be a pure receptor XYX agonist or antagonist, but upon further experimentation shown to effect a variety of biological targets. In fact, the development of a drug for a specific disease and the determination of its biological site of action usually precede linking that site of action with the disease. Thus, when mixed results are obtained, how many more drugs need be tested?

E. Suppose that our drug is an effective treatment of the disease of interest, but only when combined with some totally different drug. There are for example, agents in antiviral and anticancer chemotherapy which are not themselves effective, but are effective treatments when the agents are combined with something else.

Art Unit: 1624

Consequently, determining the true scope of the claim will involve extensive and potentially inconclusive research. Without it, one skilled in the art cannot determine the actual scope of the claim. Hence, the claim is indefinite.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. Claims 1-14 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 and 6-14 of copending

Art Unit: 1624


Application No. 09/893,698. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the compounds, compositions and method of use of the compounds of the instant invention are embraced by the compounds, compositions and method of use of the compounds of Application No. 09/893,698 where X is formula (4).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brenda Coleman whose telephone number is (703) 305-1880. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM, on Tuesdays from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM, on Wednesday thru Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-4734 for "unofficial" purposes and the actual number for **OFFICIAL** business is **308-4556**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.


Brenda Coleman
Primary Examiner AU 1624
January 13, 2003